

U.S. Application No. 09/415,060

Docket No. 0378-0360P

December 31, 2003

Art Unit: 2615

Page 15 of 21

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-18 remain pending. Claims 1 and 11 are independent.

DRAWINGS

Figures 4 and 5 are objected to for minor informalities. The drawings have been amended to address this objection as noted above. Applicant respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

§ 102 REJECTION - WATANABE

Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Watanabe (USPN 6,529,236). Applicant respectfully traverses.

For a Section 102 rejection to be proper, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every claimed element. See *M.P.E.P.* 2131; *M.P.E.P.* 706.02. Thus, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, Watanabe fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element. For example, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a digitizing circuit for converting an output of said noise reducing circuit to a digital signal in accordance with said first clock, an amount of the digital signal being substantially proportional to a ratio of said first clock to a clock outputted from said frequency selector." Claim 11 recites a similar feature. It will be demonstrated below that Watanabe cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest the above-recited feature.

Watanabe is directed toward providing a digital camera with real-time image transfer to outside of the digital camera. See *Watanabe*, column 1, lines 47-49. Watanabe indicates that a camera may be operated in full read mode, 1/2 read mode, and 1/4 read modes. See *Watanabe*, column 4, lines 24-34. In *Watanabe*, the 1/2 and 1/4 reductions are achieved only thinning of pixels in the vertical direction. See *Watanabe*, Figures 4 and 5.

However, it is noted that Watanabe is silent regarding drive frequencies of the horizontal CCD. In the Office Action, it is stated that "CCD drive control must select a driving clock for the CCD for each pixel read mode." See *Office Action*, page

3, lines 14-16. However, it is important to note that Watanabe fails to teach or suggest any words supporting the CCD drive control selecting a driving clock for the CCD for each pixel read mode.

Also in the Office Action, it is stated that "the clock for driving the full pixel read mode in Fig. 3 must be faster than the clock for driving the 1/4 pixel read mode in Fig. 5 since the full mode requires two fields to read out all pixels for interlace while the 1/4 read mode skips reading out some pixels and reads one frame at a time which requires slower clock for reading and transferring compared to the full mode." *See Office Action, page 3, lines 8-12.*

It appears that the plurality of modes and the clocks recited in claims 1 and 11 have been misunderstood. In the Office Action, the implication appears to be that in order to increase the frame rate, a usual measure is the adjustment of a horizontal drive frequency of a CCD in such a manner that that doubling the horizontal drive frequency of the CCD renders the output of pixel signals from the CCD at a doubled rate and an analog-to-digital conversion effected at a doubled clocked rate.

However, this is an understanding different that claimed in claim 1 wherein the digitizing circuit is driven with the first clock irrespective of the operating mode. In an embodiment of the present invention, the CCD is driven with different clock rates depending on the operating mode. For example, in the second mode, the CCD is driven with the horizontal drive frequency which is twice as high as the clock in the first clock.

It is clear that Watanabe may not be relied upon to teach or suggest at least the above-noted feature of independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 are distinguishable over Watanabe. Claims 5-8, 11, and 15-18 depend from independent claims 1 or 11, directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claims 1 and 11, these dependent claims are also distinguishable from over Watanabe.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, and 15-18, based on Watanabe, be withdrawn.

U.S. Application No. 09/415,060

Docket No. 0378-0360P

December 31, 2003

Art Unit: 2615

Page 19 of 21

§ 103 REJECTION - WATANABE, TAKAHASHI

Claims 2-4 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Takahashi (JP 06-141330). Applicant respectfully traverses.

It is noted that claims 2-4 and 12-14 depend from independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. It has been shown above that claims 1 and 11 are distinguishable over Watanabe. Takahashi has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to correct at least the above-noted deficiencies of Watanabe. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 11 are distinguishable over the combination of Watanabe and Takahashi.

Due to their dependencies on claims 1 and 11 as well as on their own merits, claims 2-4 and 12-14 are also distinguishable over the combination of Watanabe and Takahashi.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-4 and 12-14, based on Watanabe and Takahashi, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the

U.S. Application No. 09/415,060

Docket No. 0378-0360P

December 31, 2003

Art Unit: 2615

Page 20 of 21

present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a two (2) months extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional

U.S. Application No. 09/415,060

Docket No. 0378-0360P

December 31, 2003


Art Unit: 2615

Page 21 of 21

fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly,
extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By:  #39,491
Michael K. Mutter
Reg. No. 29,680

HNS
MKM/HNS/kmr
0378-0360P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s): Two replacement sheets for Figures 4 and 5